



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that treating of the idiomatic uses of *savoir* are well stated.

The last chapter (*vouloir*) is the most accurately stated. Its four sections (1. "Wish, Desire, Want"; 2. "Determination, Command"; 3. "Willingness, Consent"; 4. "Idiomatic Meanings") are not confused one with another, and there are no irrelevant sentences. Perhaps it would have improved some of the sentences to render by the English word 'quite,' the French word *bien* in such a sentence as "*Nous le voulons bien; mais à une condition.*" (p. 69).

In spite of its imperfections, this book is well worth consultation by the student. The practical, fresh sentences are a decided improvement upon those found in most grammars.

The book is excellently printed and has but few errors. I have noted the following: P. 3, l. 9: "you only owe me a few cents," change to 'you owe me only a few cents'; p. 3, l. 13: "subjective" read 'subjunctive'; p. 6, first column, last line: *quelque* read *quelque*; p. 6, second column, last line but two: *déjà* read *déjà*; p. 8, l. 10: "began" read 'begun'; p. 9, l. 19: *dele* the apostrophe of *It's*; p. 9, l. 20: *disent* read *dise*; p. 9, l. 21: insert hyphen in *vous-même*; p. 17, l. 26, first column: *parlé* read *parlée*; p. 18, ll. 4 and 5: *à pieds* read *à pied*; p. 28, § 1, l. 7: *qu'il* read *qu'il*; p. 30, l. 4: *qui* read *qu'il*; p. 41, last sentence: "*je crains qu'il ne (puisse) me payer ce qu'il me doit*" is hardly the statement to be expected in answer to the question: "*Pourquoi êtes-vous si inquiet?*" The insertion of *pas* after the verb to be supplied (*puisse*) would make the statement more plausible by making it negative; p. 51, l. 3: *il s'y peut* does not agree with the idiom *il y peut* on p. 50, l. 15; p. 54, l. 24: *s'est en allée* read *s'en est allée*; p. 65, fourth line from bottom: *veuiliez* read *veuiliez*; p. 66, ll. 14 and 15: insert hyphen in "today"; p. 67, l. 9: *Ne veuiliez pas* read *veuiliez ne pas*; p. 68, l. 9: if the present subjunctive *allions* is to be retained, perhaps it would be well to explain its syntax in a foot-note; p. 69, third line from end of page: "vengeance" read 'vengeance.'

PIERRE JOSEPH FREIN.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.

SPANISH GRAMMAR.

The Spanish Verb. With an Introduction on Spanish Pronunciation, by 1st Lieut. PETER E. TRAUB, 1st U. S. Cavalry, Assistant Professor of French at the U. S. Military Academy. Under the Direction of Professor E. E. WOOD, Department of Modern Languages, U. S. M. A. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company [1900]. pp. vii + 209.

In the preface we read:

"This book embodies the results of the corresponding portion of the system in vogue at the United States Military Academy, whereby a thorough knowledge of the essentials of Spanish is imparted to the cadet in the short period of three months."

This statement gives the measure of the book. One who has struggled with Spanish for years, feels that the author must either be a man of remarkable linguistic ability, or that his ideas of what constitutes "a thorough knowledge of the essentials of Spanish" are limited.

On page 2 the statement is made that "the sounds in Spanish are not given as sharply as in English, tonic accent being nothing more than a lengthening of the accented syllable." On p. 5 the student is told that "the syllable that is lengthened should always be a little higher in pitch than the others." These two statements do not agree. The first one is obviously wrong. On p. 2, also, the old-time remarks about the pronunciation of Spanish vowels are dished up once more. It is time that such statements as "*a* sounds like *a* in *mama*, *e* like *a* in *bale*, *i* like *ee* in *fee*, etc.," be banished from text-books of Spanish. The fact is that there is no vowel in English that sounds like any Spanish vowel. The note immediately following tries to rectify the mistakes just mentioned, but is only partially correct and is of limited value, as it confines itself to Spanish monosyllables.

P. 3, § 19: "F, k, l, m, n, p, t have the same sound as in English." Spanish plosives are not aspirated; Spanish *l* and English *l* are so different as to render such words as *mil*, *sal*, *papel* when pronounced with English *l* almost unintelligible to a Spaniard.

P. 3, § 20, 1: "G" before *e* or *i* is a palatal guttural like *ch* in German *ich*. P. 4, § 22: "J

is always a strong guttural produced by depressing the chin and clearing the throat, causing the soft palate to vibrate." Why this distinction between *g* before *e* or *i* and *j*? The letters are interchangeable in a great number of words, so much so, that in looking up words in a Spanish dictionary, one must constantly take this fact into account. An example is *extranjero* which Professor Traub spells *extrangero*. The description given for *j* also holds good for *g* (+ *e*, *i*) as far as the Castiles north of Madrid are concerned. In Andalusia, Mexico and Cuba the two letters are sounded like a well aspirated English *h*.

P. 4, § 28: "*R* has the sound of *r* in English; out at the beginning and end of words and after *l*, *n*, *s*, it is slightly rolled." The first part of this statement needs no refutation.

P. 4, § 30: "*S* always has the hissing sound of *s* in *sun*." This is not true before voiced consonants, e. g. *mismo*, *los dos*, *cisne*.

P. 4, § 33: "*X* has the sound of *x* in *wax*." *extrangero* and *extremo* are given among the examples and not a word is said about *x* being sounded like *s* before a consonant. Cf. the spelling *esclavo* for *esclavo*.

P. 7, § —: The division into strong and weak vowels is not arbitrary, but a "natural division" and therefore "diphthongs and triphthongs should always be pronounced more or less the same way, whether they get the tonic accent or not." We fail to understand.

P. 8, § 53: "Generally two or three consonants between vowels are separated; the first one belonging to the preceding syllable." In the next line *en-no-ble-cer* is given as an illustration.

P. 6, § —: *Ruido* is printed without a graphic accent in illustration of a rule concerning diphthongs. On p. 11 the same word is printed twice with a graphic accent. Granted that Spanish usage is not consistent in regard to words of this kind; but a text-book on Spanish ought to be, or ought to state why it is not.

P. 12, § 61: The student is told in what respects the Spanish-American countries differs from pure Castilian. Among the American characteristics we find: "*D* in the ending *ado*, is silent: *hablado* pronounced *ablao*." Not only is this pronunciation common throughout Castile, but the present writer also found that in Mexico its use

was restricted. In Castile only a few purists hold out against *ao*, while in Mexico the educated classes generally use *ado*. On the same page we read that: "*es* is generally used for *ex* when followed by a consonant not *h*: *escolente* = *excelente*." This statement is true only in regard to spelling; in regard to pronunciation Castilian usage does not differ from the American. See above.

The uses of the various moods in Spanish take up a little less than three pages. The subjunctive mood is "explained" in a little over a page. We quote: "The rules governing the subjunctive in Spanish are with one or two exceptions, practically the same as in French." The assumption that students of Spanish know French would, in itself, limit the usefulness of this statement; but aside from this, the rule is so far from being correct that it is misleading. Further on the same page we read: "We may say in English, 'if I had' or 'if I should have,' which mean exactly the same thing and correspond precisely to the forms in Spanish, *si hubiese* and *si hubiera*." Comment is unnecessary. On the same page "when he has finished, he will write" is translated *Cuando hubiere concluido*, *escribirá* and throughout the whole book this construction is enforced. The Castilian usage of to-day is *Cuando haya concluido*, etc.

So much for the first seventeen pages. We have picked out only the most obvious mistakes. The rest of the book (one hundred and ninety-two pages) is devoted to the conjugation of verbs, except pp. 76–79 which treat of Pronominal Verbs and Personal Pronouns; p. 90 where an inadequate explanation of the Impersonal Reflexive is given, and pp. 96–97 which discuss in the briefest way the Reflexive Substitute for the Passive. We have, therefore, one hundred and eighty-five pages devoted to nothing else but the accident of the verb—no idioms, no exercises, absolutely nothing except complete conjugations of verbs, with a translation for every single form in the book save in a few lists near the end. Each conjugation as a rule takes up two complete pages.

What was the object of the author in getting out such a piece of work? It contains nothing that the grammars do not treat adequately. Knapp treats the Spanish verb very fully in one hundred and twenty-one pages of large print; Ramsey, in

his larger grammar, in fifty-eight pages, in his smaller grammar, in fifty pages; and Garner in forty-five pages. The only "advantage" we can see in this new book is that it saves thinking on the part of the student and makes the learning of the Spanish verb entirely mechanical and—very tedious. That part of the book which is not taken up with mechanical details is so full of mistakes and slipshod statements that it is worthless.

The book is carefully printed. The only misprints noted are *lavámonos* for *lavémonos*, p. 77, and *dirije* for *dirige*, p. 79.

A. F. KUERSTEINER.

Indiana University.

SOME RECENT INDEXES.

Englische Studien, herausgegeben von Eugen Kölbing: Generalregister zu Band 1–25, zusammengestellt von ARTHUR KÖLBING. Leipzig, Reisland, 1902. 8vo, pp. iv, 244. Price, 8 marks.

Übersicht über die im Jahre 1896 auf dem Gebiete der englischen Philologie erschienenen Bücher, Schriften und Aufsätze, zusammengestellt von ALBERT PETRI. Supplementheft zur "Anglia," Jahrg. 1898–99, Bd. xxi. Halle, Niemeyer, 1901. 8vo, pp. iv, 175. Price, 4 marks. Same for 1897. Supplementheft zur "Anglia," Bd. xxii, 1902, pp. iv, 171. Price, 4 marks.

General-Register zum Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, 51. bis 100. Band. Zusammengestellt von Dr. HERMANN SPRINGER. Braunschweig, Westermann, 1900. 8vo, pp. iv, 285. Price, 6 marks.

The makers of such indexes as these deserve the thanks of the scholarly world, especially when they do the work in the same thorough and careful manner in which they would conduct original investigations. Such indexes greatly facilitate the work of the student and form valuable additions to his working library, even though he may not possess the periodicals themselves. These three indexes, though not perhaps of equal worth, will all be found of great value.

The problem of the arrangement of such indexes has not yet received a satisfactory solution. Each

of the three before us differs from the others in this respect. Springer, dissatisfied with the simple alphabetical author and subject list of the index to volumes 1–50 of the *Archiv*, has adopted a highly elaborate classification: I. Systematisches Verzeichnis der Beiträge. A. Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft u. Litteratur. B. Germanische (and C. Romanische) Sprachen u. Literaturen. D. Neusprachlicher Unterricht. E. Gelehrtenbiographie; gelehrte Gesellschaften. II. Alphabetisches Verzeichnis der Mitarbeiter (mit Aufzählung ihrer Beiträge—in order of publication). III. Alphabetisches Verzeichnis der besprochenen Werke (mit Verweisung auf das systematische Verzeichnis). This is all very well; but the sub-division of these groups, though logical, is perhaps too elaborate—even bewildering: thus Chaucer books and articles are entered in four different places. Kölbing arranges his matter as follows: I. Sach- u. Stellenregister. II. Rezensionenregister, with Sachindex. III. Wortregister. IV. Verzeichnis der Mitarbeiter u. ihrer Beiträge. This arrangement is simpler and more satisfactory. It would have been much better if Kölbing had combined the index to II. with the main part under one alphabet; many entries now in the index would not then have been needed. The arrangement of the *Übersicht* is that which has now been used in that annual for several years. Perhaps the gravest objection to it is the attempt to distinguish between eighteenth and nineteenth century literature (III. 3, 5), also between "Litteratur des 19. Jahrhunderts" (III. 5.) and "Neueste Litteratur" (III. 7.)—divisions of which there is no need. Nor is there any good reason for taking Shakspeare out of the alphabet of "Neuenglische Litteratur." With these exceptions the general arrangement may be defended as logical.

Kölbing's index is a creditable piece of work—well printed, easy to use, generally accurate. I note a few corrections and additions: (pp. 11, 12) since the Cædmonian authorship is not now universally accepted, there should at least have been a cross-reference under *Daniel* and *Satan*; (p. 19, l. 7 f. b.) the entry should be Sutherland, Duke of; (p. 23) under Fletcher should be a cross-reference to Beaumont; (p. 73) why not enter *R. R. Doyster* under Udall, now conceded to be its author?; the seventh entry from the bottom should